2: Underhill E-5 (1931-1935)1939 NU28 Papago NU28

684 837 could but return to her family. However, sexual offenses were a point where the native and Christian points of view overlapped. Adultery, in the eyes of the Church, was a cardinal sin, and in villages where missionary influence was felt, both male and female adulterers were punished at the whipping post.

685 The chief native offenses against property (if we except the stealing of a wife) were theft, the moving of land boundaries, and food hoarding. Theft was a rare occurrence, since all had about the same amount of possessions and since families shared even with their laziest members. In old days, it was dealt with by the Keeper, who asked the offender's family to make restitution. Public opinion forced them to comply or lose their status in the community. The moving of land boundaries was dealt with in the same way. The two landholders concerned were summoned before the Keeper by his Leg and urged to come to an agreement. Sometimes the Keeper would suggest that they should divide the land under dispute and each find an extra plot further off. The hearing usually took place before all the elders and both were ashamed to show themselves quarrelsome; so they accepted the decision. If one were recalcitrant without good cause, the council might ask him to leave the village. Food hoarding was recognized by all as a serious offense, but it was not punished. The offender was simply recognized as a public enemy and avoided to such an extent that he and his family suffered economically from lack of help and socially from loneliness and humiliation.

681 This seems to sum up the offenses and the discipline of pre-Spanish days. The community and officials acted principally as umpires and used no corporal punishment except in the killing of the shaman which was regarded as an act of self defense. The punishments of admonition and banishment which they did administer, fell, not upon the individual offender but on his whole family. It has been mentioned above that a family, particularly a father and brothers, would not desert a man no matter what his behavior. If they could not reform him, they might, themselves, take him to the authorities for a severe lecture on the fact that he was ruining his family's position. They might share in this lecture for having failed to keep him in order. If he was so impossible that he must be asked to leave the village one or more of the family would have to go with him — since an individual could hardly exist alone, — or distant relatives must take him in. In any case, there was no thought of the penalty singling out the individual and leaving the family free. With supernatural vengeance, this was particularly true for misfortune might strike any member of the family and not necessarily the culprit.